REMARKS

Claims 1-18 have been cancelled. Claims 19-26 have been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gifford et al. (U.S. Patent 6,549,612) in view of Slutsman et al. (U.S. Patent 6,604,129), further in view of Abato et al. (U.S. Patent 6,513,069). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-18 have been cancelled, thus rendering the above cited rejections mute. However, the references are addressed herein, in view of the newly added claims.

The primary reference, Gifford et al., discuss a method and system that utilizes an active interface embedded in an e-mail notification to control delivery of a non-literal, single media or multimedia message to a subscriber. *See*, abstract. The system operates under the control of a Unified Communications (UC) server. Col. 4, ll. 29-33. The Examiner stated that Gifford teaches (1) assigning in a web server of the conferencing system a unique URL for a conference (citing col. 6, ll. 25-43); (2) providing the unique URL through the internet to a web browser of the subscriber (citing col. 12 ll., 12-28); (3) delivering the unique URL and the set time through the internet from the web browser of the subscriber to each of the plurality of participants, the subscriber and the plurality of participants (col. 6, ll. 24-37; col. 14, ll. 18-65); and (4) each of the end-users clicking on the delivered URL at the set time to access the web server of the conferencing system through the internet (citing col. 12, ll. 52-67, col. 13, ll. 1-19).

Examining the cited passages of Gifford, it is apparent that Gifford does not teach assigning a unique URL for a conference. Col. 6, ll. 25-43 of Gifford states that the "UC server sends an email to subscriber that contains controls (e.g. buttons or Universal Resource Links (URLs)) which give the subscriber the ability to *interact* with server side communication functions (e.g., perform conference calling and message retrieval)." Thus, the UC sends an email-embedded graphic UI to the subscriber, which allows the subscriber

to interact with the server to perform functions, including conference calling. However, there is no teaching in the cited passages, or apparently anywhere else in Gifford, of *assigning a unique URL to a conference.*

Likewise, Gifford does not appear to teach "each of the end-users clicking on the delivered URL to access the web server of the conferencing system through the internet," as the Examiner alleges. An examination of the cited passages (col. 12, ll. 52-67, col. 13, ll. 1-19) reveals that these passages are concerned with a user, i.e., subscriber of the UC service, logging onto the UC. These passages mention nothing about setting up or accessing a conference. Rather, they are concerned with a user logging into a server via a login session using an identifier or a Cookie. Importantly, Gifford does not teach connecting a participant (i.e., a person other than the subscriber) to a teleconference as a result of that person clicking on the unique URL, which he received from the subscriber.

The secondary references fail to provide the elements that are lacking in Gifford. Slutsman et al. disclose a method and apparatus for a conference call mediation service that allows for the scheduling of multi-participant conferences over the Internet. A special Internet server acts as a mediator by conducting one or more rounds of pre-conference scheduling negotiations among potential participants. The Examiner alleges, "Slutsman discloses a communications system conducted on the Internet where the host sends a conference request to the participants that contains the potential participant addresses, the attributes of the requested conference... and established a video link between the host and the participants." (Citing col. 5, ll. 16-35, and col. 6, ll. 10-46). However, Slutsman does not teach that a unique URL is assigned to the conference or that a participant can connect to a conferencing system simply by clicking a URL that has been sent to him by the subscriber and providing identification information.

Abato et al. provide a computer-based system for receiving a video program along with embedded URLs that direct the user's computer to Web sites on the Internet to retrieve related Web pages (col. 5, ll. 41-48). The Examiner alleges that Abato teaches "a server that receives the subscriber's URL that receives the subscriber's URL through its

URL decoder and delivers the code of the URL over the internet to the user's PC" citing col. 6, ll. 56-67. This allegation does not appear to be relevant to the present claims. Particularly, neither the referenced text, nor any other text in Abato, appears to be concerned with conferencing in general and particularly with delivering a unique URL from a subscriber to a participant, wherein when the participant clicks on the URL the participant can provide identification information and connect to a conference.

In view of the above remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner acknowledge that the newly submitted claims are both novel and non-obvious in view of the cited references. Should the Examiner have any question, please do not hesitate to call Applicant's attorney/agent of record for immediate resolution.

Respectfully submitted,

September 13, 2005
Date

Raymond Reese
Reg. No. 47,891

CUSTOMER NO. 29855

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P..
20333 State Hwy 249, Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
Voice 832-446-2453
Fax 832-446-2424